

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 and 27-33 have been rejected.

Claims 13-26 were previously canceled.

Claims 1, 27 and 28 have been amended.

Claims 1-12 and 27-33 are pending in this application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 10-12, 27, 29 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al (US 5883891, hereinafter “Williams”) in view of Ernst (“Network Mobility Support in IPv6”, a PhD thesis to the Dept. of Mathematics and Computer Science at the Universite Joseph Fourier, France, October 29, 2001), hereinafter “Ernst”. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant acknowledges with thanks the Examiner’s indication in the telephone call of July 22, 2008 that this rejection can be overcome by adding the terms “without any first communication node explicit request” to the independent claims. Independent claims 1, 27 and 28 have been so amended.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 27 and 28 are now allowable.

Claims 2-6, 10-12 and 29-33 are dependent on claim 1, incorporated herein, and are therefore allowable as well for the same reasons.

Therefore, applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Ernst, as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Inoue (US 6,587,882). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 is dependent on amended claim 1, incorporated herein and previously distinguished above, and is therefore deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Ernst, as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Baba et al (US 6,799,204). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 8 and 9 are dependent on amended claim 1, incorporated herein and previously distinguished above, and are therefore deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 28 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Ernst, and further in view of Jinzaki (US 2001/0042070). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 28 contains all the same recitations as claim 1, and is therefore deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 30 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Ernst, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kajiwara (US 2002/0015386). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 30 is dependent on amended claim 1, incorporated herein and previously distinguished above, and is therefore deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 31 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Ernst, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Callon et al (US 5,854,899). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 31 and 32 are dependent on amended claim 1, incorporated herein and previously distinguished above, and are therefore deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

The other references of record have been reviewed and applicant's invention is deemed patentably distinct and nonobvious over each taken alone or in combination.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request that the above rejections be withdrawn.

Inasmuch as this amendment distinguishes all of the applicants' claims over the prior art references, for the many reasons indicated above, passing of this case is now believed to be in order. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Authorization is hereby given to charge any fees necessitated by actions taken herein to Deposit Account 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,
Janneteau et al.

Customer Number 22917

Motorola, Inc.
Law Dept. - 3rd floor
1303 E. Algonquin Rd.
Schaumburg, IL 60196

By: /Brian Mancini/
Brian M. Mancini
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 39,288
Phone: (847) 576-3992
FAX: (847) 576-3750